

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

1976

A Study of the Attitudes of Canadian Jews Toward Israel

Amiram Rokach

Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Jewish Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rokach, Amiram, "A Study of the Attitudes of Canadian Jews Toward Israel" (1976). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 1607.

<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/1607>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF
CANADIAN JEWS TOWARD ISRAEL

By

AMIRAM ROKACH

B.A. Tel Aviv University, 1973

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree
Wilfrid Laurier University

1976

Examining Committee

Dr. E.M. Bennett, Chairman
Dr. F.R.S. Binding, Dept. of Psychology
Dr. P. Franks, Dept. of Psychology

UMI Number: EC56385

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EC56385

Copyright 2012 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge with deep gratitude and appreciation, the contributions, criticisms, advice and encouragement received from the examining committee: Dr. E.M. Bennett, Dr. F.R.S. Binding and Dr. P. Franks.

Dr. D. Ashley (former chairman of the examining committee) devoted his time and patience to helping the author with early drafts of this thesis. Mr. C. McRae made very valuable suggestions dealing with statistics and format. Mr. P. Mishan devoted time and enthusiasm to helping the author secure subjects.

A very special thanks must be given to Mrs. Ester Rokach, who helped as only one would expect a wife to help.

ABSTRACT

The present study attempted to investigate the relationships between self esteem, perception of Gentiles' attitudes, and attitudes to the State of Israel, as expressed by a sample of Canadian born Jews.

Four hypotheses were formulated. The first one stated that there existed a negative relationship between perception of Gentiles' attitudes (GA) and positive attitudes toward Israel (AI). That hypothesis was supported.

The second hypothesis stated that there existed a negative relationship between self esteem (SE) and positive attitudes toward Israel (AI). That hypothesis was also supported.

The third hypothesis stated that when high positive attitudes toward Israel (HPAI) are found, there will also be found low self esteem (LSE) and perception of Gentiles' negative attitudes (NGA) in the same subject. That hypothesis was not supported.

The fourth hypothesis stated that when low positive attitudes toward Israel (LPAI) are found, there will also be found high self esteem (HSE) and perception of Gentiles' positive attitudes (PGA) in the same subject. That hypothesis was not supported.

Three main effects were examined. Firstly, it was found that the oldest people had the most favorable attitude toward Israel, while

the youngest people had the least favorable attitude towards Israel. Secondly, no significant difference was found between males and females in their attitudes toward Israel. Finally, religious affiliation was found to be an important factor in Jewish attitudes toward Israel. The more orthodox the people are, the more favorable are their attitudes toward Israel.

The findings were discussed in the context of intergroup relations, reactions to prejudice and discrimination, as well as minority-majority relationships.

Implications were drawn for improving the relationship between the Israeli Government and Jewry in Canada. Suggestions were also made for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Review of the Literature | 3 |
| Statement of Hypotheses | 20 |
| Method | 21 |
| Results | 30 |
| Discussion | 34 |
| References | 47 |
| Appendix A | 52 |
| Appendix B | 54 |
| Appendix C | 59 |
| Appendix D | 62 |
| Appendix E | 65 |
| Appendix F | 67 |

TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1 Subjects divided into subgroups according to Age, Sex, and Religious Affiliation | 23 |
| 2 Results for Hypothesis 1 | 30 |
| 3 Results for Hypothesis 2 | 30 |
| 4 Results for Hypotheses 3 and 4 | 31 |
| 5 Age Main Effect | 31 |
| 6 Sex Main Effect | 32 |
| 7 Religious Affiliation Main Effect | 32 |
| 8 Main Effects and Scores on AI Scale, GA Scale, and SE Scale for all subjects | 33 |

INTRODUCTION

All Canadians by birth belong to either a majority or a minority group. Membership in the majority group is heavily dependent upon such physical and social attributes as white skin, English speaking parents and Christian ancestors who emigrated to Canada from a Western European industrial nation. All other Canadians belong to a variety of minority groups.

It is a commonly accepted opinion (Elliot, 1971) by Canadians that their society is egalitarian. In spite of society's belief in fair play and the inherent worth and dignity of man, our society suffers from ethnic and social class prejudice and discrimination.

Members of all ethnic minorities may have the common problem of resolving their relationship with their homeland. Shall they sever their ties and consider the place of their origin to be a dim remembrance of things past, or shall they think of themselves as countrymen who have been compelled to settle abroad by external circumstances, and look forward to their future return to the homeland?

The Jewish people have been a minority group for thousands of years and have suffered from prejudice, discrimination, and anti-Semitism. After two thousand years of being homeless, Jews may now consider Israel as their homeland. This may have caused changes in their attitudes toward themselves, Gentiles, and the State of Israel.

Attitudes are acquired as a vital part of the interaction of the individual with society, and are most important for the individuals' relationships and adjustment. Hollander (1967) indicated the role attitudes take in everyday life. "Taking appropriate attitudes toward oneself, toward other people, groups and toward other objects in the environment is basic to being human." (p. 116)

The present study attempted to predict attitudes toward an object from various attitudes of the individual toward himself, and from his perception of the attitudes of others towards him. The dependent variable was the attitude of Canadian-born Jews toward Israel, as influenced by two independent variables: personal self esteem and perception of the attitudes of Gentiles toward Jews, all as measured by self report.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Ethnic groups, when they are found within the context of a large society, are usually minority groups. This is not invariably the case, but ethnic groups are frequently subordinated, to some extent, in the social structure and would hence qualify for the designation of minorities. They are also frequently the target of prejudice and discrimination, which would also make them eligible for this label. Elliot (1971) identified and described the various aspects of majority and minority groups.

One element in Elliot's definition of a minority group is a shared physical, social or cultural characteristic that sets the group apart from the larger society. The distinguishing characteristic responsible for the group's subjection to unequal and differential treatment, is usually an "ascribed" rather than an "achieved" characteristic. Examples of ascribed status important in Canada are skin colour, mother tongue, religious heritage, and national origin. That is to say, a person is literally born a minority Canadian.

"Minority" and "ethnic" are adjectives that tend to be used interchangeably describing groups which share a common language, religion or national origin other than that of the dominant or core group. Ethnocentrism refers to the allegiance and loyalty which one displays towards the in-group. This attachment is partly emotional in character and tends to influence one's judgement about

other groups. Characteristically, the out-group is judged by the standards of the in-group, the bias for the norms and values of the in-group is likely to result in an unfavorable comparison against other groups. Ethnocentrism, in its various forms, seems to be universal among human groups. It assumes many forms; nationality, religion, community region, social class, ideology, occupation and so on.

Martin & Franklin (1973) indicated that although contact with other groups and other cultures by means of travel, education, or some other form of communication, seems to moderate ethnocentrism, it does not insure that ethnocentrism will be eliminated. Such contact may only serve to reinforce it, because ethnocentrism conditions perception in such a way that the foreign are perceived automatically as inferior and unnatural.

As a general concept in the study of intergroup relations ethnocentrism is very valuable, but concepts more related to the present study are prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice usually refers to an attitude or predisposition to judge negatively members of the minority group. Discrimination is the behavior which results in minorities being maltreated or excluded. Prejudice and discrimination may be seen as properties of groups, as well as attributes of individuals. Jones (1972) reviewed the term "prejudice" in the American context. In that context, the term "prejudice" has usually been res-

erved for those attitudes and behaviors that have characterized particular kinds of relations between the white Protestant majority and the racial, ethnic, and religious minorities. This emphasis is captured in the definition offered by Gordon Allport (1954) in his classic book The Nature of Prejudice.

Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed towards a group as a whole, or towards an individual because he is a member of that group. (p. 10)

There are two important elements in Allport's view of prejudice:

1. It is basically a negative attitude.
2. Its existence puts the object of prejudice at an unjust disadvantage.

Jones (1972) saw psychological as well as sociological aspects in prejudiced people. The psychological position, which emphasizes feelings and attitudes, is in contrast to the sociological position, which emphasizes the primacy of "groupness". In order to develop a negative attitude, there must be some positive referent for comparison. The referent is the group to which the prejudiced individual belongs. The sociological view ignores the feelings which members of one ethnic group have towards members of another. Ultimately, we must be concerned with the attitude one person has toward another and with the

behavior that attitude implies for a specific situational interaction.

Martin & Franklin (1973) defined prejudice as a rigid, emotional attitude towards a group which is usually negative (unfavorable, hostile) and which results in prejudgement of members of the group. Discrimination was seen as the behavior which is closely related to prejudice, and is usually caused by it.

It is our contention that most discrimination is a consequence of prejudice. Some discrimination is surely for rational reasons, such as gaining some kind of economic advantage; however, the social-psychological processes that are involved are such that it is quite likely that the person who practices discrimination for rational reasons as the outset, will eventually come to rationalize (in the Freudian and unconscious sense of the word) his actions. (p. 238)

Although it is difficult to resolve the question of whether or not Jews constitute an ethnic group, there can be little dispute that they have been a minority group wherever they lived. In fact, Jews might be cited as the classic example of a minority group. Historically, Jews have almost always been in a minority situation, and this seems partly due to the relatively small size of the group. Small groups are preferable to large ones for scape-goating purposes, and Jews have been exposed to both prejudice and discrimination which were united in the name: anti-Semitism.

According to Selznick & Steinberg (1969), to focus solely on beliefs about Jews would be to over estimate the extent of contemp-

orary anti-Semitism. In recent decades, discrimination against Jews in college admissions, in resorts, hotels, housing and in public life generally, has sharply declined. Selznick & Steinberg saw anti-Semitic ideology as:

A 'theory' that either explains why Jews have so much more than other people, or treats alleged Jewish wealth as evidence that Jews are money-mad, unethical, and power-hungry. (p. 7)

Responses to the question of Jewish money, ambition and scholastic performance, underscore the observation frequently made in the literature, that once anti-Semitic prejudice exists in a society, even facts about Jews take on an ambiguous quality. It is a characteristic of ideological anti-Semites to believe firmly in various untruthful fantasies about Jews. But it is also characteristic of ideological anti-Semites to interpret certain "facts" about Jews in perverse and malicious ways.

Anti-Semitism, while it has undoubtedly declined in North America since the 1930's and the 1940's, has not declined radically and is still far from vanishing. Rosenberg (1971) pointed out that since the Six Day War, new anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli movements and allegiances have begun to make their appearance. Selznick & Steinberg studied anti-Semitism in the U.S., and by using the index of anti-Semitic belief they found that roughly a third of their sample (37%) were high on anti-Semitism. Respondents were classi-

fied as anti-Semites only if they gave anti-Semitic responses to at least five of the eleven items that made up the index.

It is frequently contended, often by Jews themselves, that what is called anti-Semitic beliefs should not be regarded as anti-Semitic since they have at least some basis of reality. This argument assumes a basic distinction between "true" beliefs and "false" beliefs about Jews. One might suppose that people frequently in contact with Jews would be the most apt to accept "true" beliefs and the least likely to accept "false" beliefs. But this is not the case. Contact with Jews has much the same relation to "true" beliefs as it has to "false" beliefs; nearly every belief about Jews is most often accepted by people with the least contact with Jews.

Elliott (1971) indicated that prejudice and discrimination have deleterious affects both on the individual and on society. On the individual level, being the object of prejudice and discrimination often results in personality disorganization, or what is commonly referred to as mental illness. A minority individual may not be able to function effectively or cope with a social system that is systematically designed to exclude or frustrate him. Understandably, he may 'break down' or become personally disorganized as a result of day-to-day stresses and strains.

While the Canadian Jewish population is not presently threatened with physical persecution, the mere fact of being a minority

may be reinforcing a situation in which anti-Semitic prejudice and discrimination may develop. Most of the Canadian Jewish population is concentrated in the larger cities of Canada and is living amongst a Gentile majority population. According to Wrightsman (1972) a situation in which two or more racial or religious groups occupy the same territory, may lead to intergroup prejudice. The degree of prejudice expressed is a function of the relative size of the several groups.

Gerson (1965) reviewed the situation of the Jewish population in the U.S.A. and concluded his review by analyzing the reasons for the strains that Jews experienced in America.

The primary structural strains contemporary Jews experience, stem from their dual memberships in American society. They are for all intents and purposes, well cultured members of the society. But they are also members of an ethnic minority group with a still distinct subculture. In certain areas of behavior, these two social systems make contradictory claims on Jewish persons. (p. 302)

Many studies have shown that members of minority groups who are raised and live in a mixed social and religious context, are likely to manifest symptoms of psychic or emotional disturbances and are generally affected by the hostile environment. Katz (1960) studied the different functions served by prejudice and suggested that attitudes of prejudice help to sustain the individual's self concept by maintaining a sense of superiority over others. Radke-Yarrow

(1958) studied Jewish children ranging in age from seven to seventeen. She conducted informal group discussions with twenty-six groups, each consisting of six children. The major topic was the interaction of Jews and non-Jews. During those sessions the youngsters expressed their feelings that the non-Jewish world was essentially hostile toward Jews. The general impression of the author was that Jewish children have not only to confront conflicts and struggles related to their own growth, but also those related to their minority status. The author also indicated that Jewish adolescents expressed the highest level of insecurity as compared to younger children.

Other studies of Jews (Sarnoff 1951, Auld 1952, Clark 1955, Sanua 1962 and Sklare 1971) showed that as members of a minority group they tended to develop frustration, feelings of inferiority, strong symptoms of anxiety and deep feelings of insecurity. Clark (1955) noted that no systematic study or theoretical article, dealing with the impact of minority status on personality traits, has ever suggested that a person subjected to prejudice, discrimination or segregation would benefit thereby.

There is convincing evidence that the personality damage associated with these social pressures is found among all children subjected to them without regard to racial, nationality or religious background. As minority group children learn the inferior status to which they are assigned, and observe that they are usually segregated and isolated, they react with deep feelings of inferiority and with a sense of personal humiliation. (p. 63)

A considerable body of evidence, deriving from studies with non-Jewish minority groups, seems to support the conclusion drawn by Clark. Libeow (1967) indicated the fact that psychological effects of prejudice and discrimination were highly stressful for minority group members. He stated that Black people in American society were likely to experience painful stresses resulting from low self image, bitterness and anxiety. Studies of U.S. Negroes (McLean 1946, Meyers & Yochelson 1948, Adorno 1950, Kardiner 1951 and Clark 1955) suggested that the Negro in the United States was constantly receiving an unfavorable image of himself, and because of the insecurity involved in being a Negro, the Negro became chronically anxious and fearful.

Following a study of an Italian minority group by Tait (1946), it was shown that prejudice and rejection resulted in such character defects as feelings of inferiority and emotional instability.

There are many studies that have sought to probe the cause of anti-Semitism. Why does the anti-Semite hate? Why is the Jew hated? These are the questions which have provided the starting point of such investigations. But there is another aspect of the matter which has received comparatively little attention. How does anti-Semitism influence the psychology of the Jew who is exposed to its pressures? (Herman 1945, p. 1)

In answering his question, Herman (1945), as well as other researchers, has pointed out insecurity, sensitivity to their position as a minority group, suspicion and hostility, as some of the outcomes of being subject to prejudice and discrimination. Herman concluded:

A group which is insecure and sensitively registers all rebuffs, may be expected to develop an attitude of suspicion toward Gentiles in general, when such rebuffs occur with any frequency. Jewish people are so sensitive that sometimes they suspect anti-Semitism where it may not be. (p. 5)

Martin & Franklin (1973) pointed out that people who are objects of prejudice and discrimination tend to be resentful and develop hostility against those who practice it against them. Conflict is also stimulated by the ill will and condescension which underlie prejudice and discrimination. Aggressive behavior is prompted by the same kinds of emotions and situations which produces prejudicial and discriminatory behavior. Bitterness and disillusionment are commonplace reactions to prejudice but the degree depends upon the personality and the experiences of the individual. Martin & Franklin continued their analysis by indicating the psychological mechanisms that are involved in reaction to prejudice. Repression and denial is the type of minority group reaction which is a defence mechanism used to expel the disturbing and painful effects of prejudice from conscious perception. Closely associated with repression and denial, is the tendency for successful minority group members to feel guilty because they are not making sufficient contributions to the minority group cause. While minority group members can, and often do, experience guilt apart from repression and denial, the ultimate recognition by the minority group member that he is perceived by his own group as a "scab", reinforces his own feelings of self doubt.

Martin & Franklin saw cynicism as another mechanism which is involved in minority reactions to prejudice. Cynicism suggests that, because a person is a member of a minority group, all behaviors he emits are directed toward the maintenance of his superior position. In those instances where a minority group has experienced a long history of subjugation with few meaningful changes in imbalanced intergroup interaction patterns, it is easy to see how such an attitude might emerge.

From a majority group's perspective, counter-prejudice may be the most bewildering reaction to prejudice and discrimination. The name of counter-prejudice was given to the phenomenon where members of minority groups have negative attitudes toward majority group members. Cothran (1951) pointed out that Blacks in the United States held unfavorable predispositions toward Whites long before the current emphasis on Black nationalism.

The last, the main, and the most important phenomenon that occurs as an outcome of prejudice, and which Martin & Franklin mentioned frequently, is compensation. Compensation is a psychological reaction which may be closely related to repression and denial. Minority group members have often used compensation as a type of protective mechanism whereby the individual engages in alternative activities in order to protect himself from the inimical effects of prejudice and discrimination. Frequently, persons predisposed to the utilization of

compensation, overindulge in the activity. Compensation, in contrast to repression and denial, implies recognition of prejudice and discrimination. However, once they have been recognized, the individual shields himself behind other activities, and patterns of prejudice and discrimination are weakened.

Adler (1917), when developing his personality theory, recognized that feelings of inferiority, anxiety and insecurity may cause the person to strive for compensation. Such compensation may result in feelings of security, worth and acceptance. Rogers (1951) postulated that a basic motive of the human being is the striving for a feeling of worth and actualization.

Clark (1955) suggested that minority group members are striving for compensation which may have been expressed in forms apparently unrelated to the racial problem. Minority group members have often used compensation as a mechanism to reduce the negative impact of prejudice. An example of the kind of compensation evidenced by minority group members is the large number of Negro athletes in the top ranks of many U.S. sports.

Based on evidence of previously reviewed literature, it may be that Jewish people born and living in Canada will be influenced by their perceptions of their minority status. Such characteristics as anxiety, insecurity, feelings of homelessness and feelings of inferiority may be highly evident in this population.

In contrast to low self esteem found in the Jewish population in the Diaspora, i.e. all countries outside Israel, Sanua (1962) in his study of native born Israelies, indicated that people who were born and raised in Israel presented different personality traits from those of the Jews in the Diaspora. Lewin (1935) indicated that while Jews in the Diaspora suffered from tension, unbalanced behavior and restlessness, the Jews who lived in Israel showed absence of these characteristics and presented feelings of security and worth. Sklare (1971) indicated that the state of Israel had a positive influence, not only upon Jews who settled or were born there, but upon Jews all over the world.

The establishment of Israel means that the Jewish people are no longer weak and defenseless. Israel has given the Jews psychological freedom to appear in public as Jews. (p. 215)

The existence of the state of Israel has special significance for the Jewish people. The feelings of pride and sense of belonging to their own homeland might be seen to act as compensation for feelings of insecurity and low self esteem.

Zweig (1958), Kamerling (1959), Plaugt (1968) and Dinur (1969) have indicated that Jews in the Diaspora may have a dual relationship with Israel. While they may be donating money, touring there, or helping the state economically, they may also be developing a greater self acceptance, feeling of worth and of higher self esteem. Clark

(1955) analyzed the history of the American nation and indicated the assumption that the people who made that new country were driven from their homeland by some basic form of personal and social insecurity and by religious or political persecution. Clark suggested that by immigrating and settling in the new country, they were able to feel more secure and gain personal confidence.

The present study was based on the assumption that the individual sees and experiences the world around him subjectively. He does not react only to the objective world, but mainly to the subjective world as he sees it. It was also suggested that the individual's self acceptance, feeling of worth and self esteem are formed and moulded by his subjective impression of what others think of him. This presumption has been postulated by others including Rogers (1951), Sarnoff (1951), Deutch & Solomon (1959) and Rosenberg (1965).

Explanations of the intergroup behavior must take into account the unique properties of the intergroup interaction in question. Social interaction is symbolic in character. It entails persons interpreting and defining each other's action instead of merely reacting to each other's actions. In other words, a person does not react directly to another's actions, but rather, he reacts to the meaning which the action has for him. This is true, not only for interindividual interaction, but also individual-group interaction and intergroup interaction.

A study of relations between social groups requires at least a three dimensional analysis. These dimensions relate to the individual as he interacts with himself, the individual as he interacts with the group, and the group as it interacts with other groups. (Martin & Franklin 1973, p.118)

The first dimension that Martin & Franklin mentioned is related to the concept of "Self". In psychological terms, the self has at least two connotations. One meaning implies that persons have attitudes and feelings about themselves, and the other meaning emphasizes the set of psychological processes which influences behavior and adjustment.

Paul F. Secord and Carl W. Backman (1964) have made the following observation about the self.

One consequence of being human is that a person becomes an object to himself. Because of his possession of language and a superior intelligence, man has a unique capacity for thinking about his body, his behavior and his appearance to other persons. Each of us has a set of cognitions and feelings toward ourselves. The term most commonly applied to this set of elements is 'Self'. (p. 579)

Studies of Jews indicated several variables that may influence their attitudes toward Israel. These variables are: age, sex and religious affiliation.

Harris & Watson (1946) and Prothro (1952) suggested that opinions and attitudes differed at different ages, and Campbell (1947) found that age influenced the attitudes expressed.

Kage (1962) indicated the fact that Canadian Jewry in the Twentieth Century could be divided into three subgroups according to historical events:

A. The Jews born in Canada between the years 1900 and 1929:

These people were characterized as people born in a free and peaceful country, far from the war in Europe. They developed a positive self esteem and pride in their status as Canadian Jews which resulted in feelings of security.

B. Jewish people born in Canada between the years 1930 and 1947:

These people were exposed to anti-Semitism because it had spread throughout the world. Terrified refugees coming from Europe during and after World War II intensified the Jewish Canadian feelings of insecurity. Kage (1962) pointed out that the desire for a homeland was expressed in Zionist movements that developed in Canada at that period of time, and was a result of their low self esteem, anxiety and feelings of insecurity.

C. Jewish people born in Canada between the years 1948 and 1957:

This time period was after the declaration of the state of Israel, but between the two Israeli-Arab wars. The Jewish children of this period were taught that they had a homeland and they were living in a host country.

Rosenberg (1971) in his book The Jewish Community in Canada, indicated that Jewish people born in the three different periods of time differed in their way of life, their self concept, and their attitudes toward Israel.

Studies by Sodhi (1958), Toch & Rabin (1962) and Rosenberg (1965) indicated that there were significant differences in judgments and attitudes between male and female. It may be that Jewish males have different attitudes toward Israel than do Jewish females.

Shmueli (1958), Hertzberg (1961) and Plaut (1968) indicated that Israel was important to Jews not only because of its present value and contribution to their life, but also because the Jewish religion and Jewish tradition saw Israel as an important factor to Judaism. It was suggested that Jewish people were influenced by the religious meanings that were attributed to this land. The stronger their religious affiliation, the stronger their relationship to Israel. Time magazine (March 10, 1975), in discussing the American Jewish community and their ties and attitudes to Israel, suggested that:

No other ethnic group has a religion that is so centered in its very rituals and prayers on a particular land. (p. 19)

The present study attempted to predict attitudes toward Israel as a function of Jewish perception of Gentiles' attitudes towards Jews, and of personal self esteem of Jewish people.

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

1. It was hypothesized that there existed a negative relationship between attitudes toward Israel and perception of Gentiles' attitudes.
2. It was hypothesized that there existed a negative relationship between attitudes toward Israel and self esteem.
3. It was hypothesized that where a high positive attitude toward Israel (HPAI) is found, there will be found low self esteem (LSE) and perception of Gentiles' negative attitude (NGA) in the same subject.
4. It was hypothesized that where a low positive attitude toward Israel (LPAI) is found, there will be found high self esteem (HSE) and perception of Gentiles' positive attitudes (PGA) in the same subject.

Based on evidence of previously reviewed literature, differences in attitudes were expected to exist due to age, sex and religious affiliation variables. These variables were examined empirically as main effects, which might have influenced Jewish attitudes toward Israel.

METHOD

Subjects

A sample of 198 subjects was selected from Canadian born Jews who live in Toronto. Subjects were selected only from among those Jews who were willing to participate. Toronto is one of the largest Canadian cities with a significantly large population of Jews. Therefore, subjects from synagogues, Jewish organizations, Jewish recreation centres and Jewish clubs were easily secured.

The author selected an equal number of subjects to be in each subgroup (11 subjects) as a pretest had shown that randomly chosen subjects would be concentrated in some subgroups whilst other subgroups would be left empty, therefore, making statistical analysis for those subgroups impossible. For this reason, and for statistical convenience reasons, the same number of subjects were chosen for every subgroup.

Questionnaires were given to about 80 subjects (40% of the total number of subjects), and the remaining subjects were given only the personal data questionnaire. They were asked to participate^{further} only if they could be classified in one of the subgroups that was not yet filled.

Previously reviewed studies indicated different variables that might influence one's perception and attitudes. Therefore, subjects were divided into three subgroups according to age, sex and religious affiliation.

Age

Subjects were divided into three age groups according to the three historical events that might have affected them (Kage, 1962):

18 to 27 years.

28 to 45 years.

46 to 75 years. .

Sex

Data analysis considered the variable of sex. Studies by Sodhi (1958), Toch and Rabin (1962), and Rosenberg (1965) indicated that the sex variable affected judgements toward oneself as well as toward others.

Degree of Religious Affiliation

Subjects were divided into three subgroups: Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. Studies by Shmueli (1958), Hertzberg (1961) and Plaugt (1968) indicated that the religious affiliation variables might affect Jews' attitudes and relations toward Israel. It was suggested that the stronger their religious affiliation, the stronger their relationship to Israel (Plaugt, 1968).

TABLE 1

SUBJECTS DIVIDED INTO SUBGROUPS ACCORDING
TO AGE, SEX, AND RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION.

| Rel. Affil. | Age | | 18-27 | | 28-45 | | 46-75 | | Total Number of Subjects |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|--------------------------------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | |
| Orthodox | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 66 |
| Conservative | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 66 |
| Reform | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 66 |
| Total number of subjects | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 198 |

Test Material

Israeli Attitude Scale

This scale was formulated and used by Zak (1972) in his research on American Jewish attitudes toward Israel. Zak's scale was modified to measure attitudes of Canadian-Born Jews towards Israel. In the present study the words "America" or "U.S." were changed to "Canada", and "Americans" was changed to "Canadians". This scale

contains twenty statements including twelve which denote affective tendencies and eight which denote behavioral tendencies. The judgments were made on a six-point scale ranging from +3 to -3. The maximum score possible was +60 (a subject which agreed very strongly with all statements). The minimum score possible was -60 (a subject which disagreed very strongly with all statements). (See Appendix B for a copy of the modified scale.)

Jewish Perception of Gentiles' Attitude Scale

This Semantic Differential scale was formulated by Morsbach (1972) in her study of Autostereotype and Heterostereotype of different ethnic groups. Morsbach compared the concept "ME" of several ethnic groups as seen by the members of each group and by members of other groups. The semantic differential is a multi-dimensional rating with three major factors of evaluation, potency and activity. An individual attitude toward an object can be represented as a point in attitudinal space, where his ratings for these factors coincide.

Morsbach's scale included twenty pairs of adjectives, of which nine represented the potency factor, four the activity factor, and seven the evaluative factor. (The potency and evaluative factors had the highest loading - see also Zak, 1972). Two more pairs were not included in Morsbach's scale but were added to the scale used in the present study, in order to increase the number of activity factor adjectives. The pairs are "repetitive-varied" and "static-dynamic"

which represented the activity factor. Jewish Perception of Gentiles' Attitudes Scale, therefore, contained 22 pairs of adjectives. The judgements were made on a seven-point scale, ranging from 1 to 7. The overall maximum score possible was 154. The minimum overall score possible was 22. (See Appendix C).

Self Esteem Scale

This scale was developed by Rosenberg (1965) and was used by Zak (1972) to rank people unidimensionally on self esteem. Rosenberg's scale is a Guttman type scale, which contains ten items, and has been found to have high scalability. Judgements were made on a six-point scale, ranging from +3 (AVS) to -3 (DVS). The maximum score available was +30, and the minimum score available was -30. (See Appendix D).

Personal Data Questionnaire

This questionnaire included questions about age, sex and degree of religious affiliation.

There is evidence (Kertzer 1960, Plaut 1968 and Livitnoff 1969) that the three major religious groupings in Judaism (Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform) are subject to individual's perception, and Jewish people might consider themselves related to one group and still behave in some ways as would the other groups. As faith and interpretation of Jewish and Biblical laws seem to be the main distinction between the different categories of religious affiliation, no question-

naire was used to find what is the religious affiliation of subjects. However, subjects were asked to rate themselves in one of the three categories that applied to them.

Subjects were divided into age subgroups as follows: 18-27; 28-35; 36-45; 46-60; 61 and over. According to a pretest that was done by the present investigator, it was found that by dividing the age variable into 5 subgroups, it was more easily understood and accepted by the subjects than by dividing it into three subgroups. There was also a possibility of subjects uncovering the purpose of the three age subgroups, and therefore, it was necessary to change the categorization to one that had more face validity. However, in the analysis of the data, subjects were grouped into the three age groups that were mentioned before: 18-27 years; 28-45 years; and 46-75 years. (See Appendix E).

Procedure

Subjects were given a set of questionnaires and a letter to the participant which explained their task (See Appendix A). They were asked to give their opinion and attitudes about certain topics and also some personal information. Subjects were given the questionnaires in their free time at recreation centres, and they filled them out in the presence of the investigator. They were not limited in time and were free to ask questions after answering the questionnaires.

Scoring

Scores - Responses on Israeli Attitude Scale and Self Esteem Scale were calculated according to the following values:

| | |
|-------------------------|----|
| Agree very strongly: | +3 |
| Agree strongly: | +2 |
| Agree: | +1 |
| Disagree: | -1 |
| Disagree strongly: | -2 |
| Disagree very strongly: | -3 |

Scores of perception of Gentiles' attitudes scale were ranging between 1 and 7.

Israeli Attitude Scale - In order to get distinctive groupings of attitudes, the cumulative frequency of cases was divided into three subgroups, (1st to 66th case, 67th to 132nd case, and 133rd to 198th case). A high score (HPAI) was considered a score that was equal to, or larger than, 30.3 (in the range of 30.3 to +58). A mild score (MPAI) was considered to be a score that was within the range of +11.6 to +30.2. A low score (LPAI) was considered a score that was within the range of -37 to +11.5.

Jewish Perception of Gentiles' Attitude Scale - Scores were divided into three subgroups, as in Israeli Attitude Scale. A high score (PGA) was considered a score that was within the range of 103.7 to 136. A neutral score (MGA) was considered a score that was within

the range of 92.3 to 103.6, and a low score (NGA) was considered a score that was within the range of 57 to 92.2.

Self Esteem Scale - Scores were divided into three groupings, as in Israeli Attitude Scale. A high score (HSE) was considered a score that was within the range 15.6 to 30. A low score was considered a score that was within the range -20 to 8.1. A medium score (MSE) was considered a score that was within the range of 8.2 to 15.5.

Data Analysis

To assess relationship No. 1, a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was calculated between scores of perception of Gentiles' attitudes and scores of attitudes toward Israel for all subjects.

To assess relationship No. 2, a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was calculated between scores of self esteem and scores of attitudes toward Israel for all subjects.

A Chi Square for k independent samples was calculated between perception of Gentiles' attitudes scores and self esteem scores, within the group that scored HPAI. The Chi Square was calculated in order to assess relationship No. 3.

To assess relationship No. 4, a Chi Square for k independent samples was calculated between perception of Gentiles' attitudes scores and self esteem scores, within the group that scored LPAI.

A Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis was calculated in order to compare the three age groups' scores in the Israeli Attitude Scale.

To assess the sex main effect, a Mann-Whitney "U" test was calculated in order to compare males' and females' overall score in the Israeli Attitude Scale.

To assess the religious affiliation main effect, a Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis was calculated in order to compare the three religious groups' score in the Israeli Attitude Scale.

RESULTS

Hypothesis No. 1 was supported. A significant negative correlation between perception of Gentiles' attitudes and attitudes towards Israel was found (see Table 2).

TABLE 2
RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESIS 1

| r_s | N | t val. | df | α |
|-------|-----|--------|-----|----------|
| -.49 | 198 | -7.86 | 196 | .0005 |

Hypothesis No. 2 was also supported. A significant negative correlation was found between self esteem and attitudes toward Israel (see Table 3).

TABLE 3
RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESIS 2

| r_s | N | t val. | df | α |
|-------|-----|--------|-----|----------|
| -.67 | 198 | -12.62 | 196 | .0005 |

Hypotheses 3 and 4 were not supported. No particular combination of SE and GA was found to be a dominant factor within the groups HPAI and LPAI (see Table 4).

TABLE 4
RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESES 3 and 4

| GROUP | χ^2 | N | df | α |
|-------|---------------|----|------|----------------|
| HPAI | $\chi^2=6.29$ | 56 | df=4 | Not Signif. |
| LPAI | $\chi^2=3.41$ | 66 | df=4 | Not Signif. |

An age main effect was found. (See table 5). There is a significant difference in mean scores between the three age groups. The oldest people have the highest, while the youngest have the lowest mean score of attitudes toward Israel (see Tables 5 and 8).

TABLE 5
AGE MAIN EFFECT

| H | α | N |
|--------|----------|-----|
| -36.88 | .01 | 198 |

A sex main effect was not found. Females did not score differently on Israeli Attitude Scale than did males (see Table 6 and 8).

TABLE 6
SEX MAIN EFFECT

| Z | α | N |
|-------|----------------|-----|
| 1.797 | Not Signif. | 198 |

Results showed a significant religious affiliation main effect. Among the three religious groups, Orthodox Jews have the highest while Reform Jews have the lowest mean score on the Israeli Attitude Scale (see Table 7 and 8).

TABLE 7
REL. AFFIL. MAIN EFFECT

| H | α | N |
|--------|----------|-----|
| -42.82 | .01 | 198 |

TABLE 8

MAIN EFFECTS AND SCORES ON AI SCALE, GA SCALE, AND SE SCALE
FOR ALL SUBJECTS

| Groups | VARIABLES | | | AI SCALE | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|--------|
| | | | | AGE | | | SEX | | REL. AFFILIATION | | |
| | AI | GA | SE | Young | Middle | Old | Male | Female | Orth. | Cons. | Reform |
| \bar{X} | 18.86 | 99.26 | 12.53 | +16.81 | +17.59 | +20.74 | +17.27 | +19.25 | +23.48 | +20.16 | +12.00 |
| n | 198 | 198 | 198 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 99 | 99 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| r_s | AI & GA = $-.49$ AI & SE = $-.67$ | | | | | | | | | | |

DISCUSSION

Canadians may be divided into majority and minority groups. Membership in the majority group is heavily dependent upon such physical and social attributes as white skin, English speaking parents and Christian ancestors who emigrated to Canada from a western European industrial nation. Elliot (1971) presented the point, which is commonly accepted by Canadians, that their society is egalitarian. In spite of society's belief in fair play, inherent worth and dignity of man, our society suffers from ethnic and social class prejudice and discrimination. Consequently, minority group members might be affected in their self esteem and the way they perceive the attitude of others towards them. As a result, they might develop positive attitudes as well as an attachment to a place in which they would not be a minority group - their country of origin.

The present study predicted that positive attitudes toward Israel were composed of two dimensions: Self esteem and perception of Gentiles' attitudes toward Jews, as perceived by Canadian born Jews. These two dimensions were seen as the direct reasons, (even though not the only ones), for the formation of positive attitudes held by a sample of Canadian Jews to the State of Israel.

It is often claimed that to understand conflicts between minority and majority groups is the essence of ethnic studies. Accordingly, researchers have focused their attention on the minority

group, as it is perceived by the majority. The present investigator has, however, a different view. The first step in understanding ethnicity requires an examination of the ethnic group as it is perceived by its members, which means how they perceive themselves, the majority reactions and behavior to them and their country of origin.

Martin & Franklin (1973) emphasized this point. According to them, explanations of intergroup behavior must take into account the unique properties of the intergroup interaction in question. Social interaction is symbolic in character. It entails persons interpreting and defining each other's actions instead of merely reacting to them. To reiterate, a person does not react directly to another's actions, but rather to the meaning which the action has for him. The authors concluded that their proposition was true not only for inter-individual interaction, but also individual-group interaction and inter-group interaction. The present investigator adopted this point of view, and centred the study on Canadian born Jews and their perception of themselves as well as their environment.

The first hypothesis of the present study suggested that there existed a negative relationship between attitudes toward Israel and perception of Gentiles' attitudes. This hypothesis was supported ($r = -.49; p = .0005$). It may be that this negative relationship was caused by the belief of the subjects that in Israel, where the majority group consists of Jewish people, they will be evaluated differently

than in Canada.

As was previously mentioned, the relationship between attitudes toward Israel and self esteem, could have been based upon compensation. It was suggested that subjects, who were mainly obtained in Jewish recreation centres, also attended these centres because of perception of the negative attitudes of Gentiles. It might be that this situation required some form of compensation which could have been found in positive attitudes toward Israel which were encouraged in those recreation centres.

The second hypothesis suggested that there existed a negative relationship between attitudes toward Israel and self esteem. This hypothesis was supported ($r = -.67; p = .0005$). Zak (1972) investigated Jewish identity, self esteem and attitudes toward Israel among Jews in the U.S. He reported that there was a strong negative correlation between self esteem and attitudes toward Israel.

According to the results obtained in the present study, we may assume that living in a host country among Gentiles, may cause Jewish people to develop a feeling of inferiority and consequently, a low self esteem. Having a long history as a scape-goated minority group, may lead Jewish people to believe that they are perceived negatively by Gentiles. The State of Israel may give Jewish people the feeling of belonging and security which may compensate their low self esteem.

Sklare (1971) indicated that the establishment of the State of Israel has given the Jewish people psychological support, and it serves as evident that the Jewish people have their own homeland whereby they are the majority group. Pride and security are related, by the Jews in the Diaspora, to that State.

The third hypothesis suggested that when high positive attitudes toward Israel are found, there will be found low self esteem and perception of Gentiles' negative attitudes in the same subject. This hypothesis was not supported ($\chi^2 = 6.29$):

The fourth hypothesis suggested that when low positive attitudes toward Israel are found, there will be found high self esteem and perception of Gentiles' positive attitudes in the same subject. This hypothesis was not supported ($\chi^2 = 3.41$).

A Chi square was also calculated between perception of Gentiles' attitudes and self esteem within the group that scored MPAT. No relationship was found to exist. ($\chi^2 = 5.60$, not significant at 5% level).

It is quite difficult to compare the above results to the existing literature in ethnicity, because the literature does not examine the bonds between the factors under investigation. It may be that each one of the independent variables is negatively related to the dependent variables and affects it. However, the present

study could not provide the proof that the interaction between the two independent variables affect the dependent variables in any direction, or at all.

The research literature, as well as the present study, was not able to provide sufficient evidence in order to answer one of the questions that was previously mentioned. Even though it is clear that self esteem as well as perception of Gentiles' attitudes, takes an important part in moulding Jewish subjects' attitudes toward Israel, there was no indication as to which one of the two is the dominant variable. It is quite possible that neither of them are dominant, and they are equally important. Moreover, it seems that the combination of them is not responsible for the differences in attitudes toward Israel.

Support for this point of view could be seen in a research by Martin & Franklin (1973) who suggested that a study of relations between and within social groups, required at least a three dimensional analysis. These dimensions relate to the individual as he interacts with the group, the individual as he interacts with himself, and the group as it interacts with other groups. The authors emphasized that besides self esteem and individual perception of others' attitudes toward him, there are many important factors which determine the individual's behavior and attitudes. Needless to say, self esteem and perception of others' attitudes toward oneself are

important, but it is quite difficult, with the measurement tools we have today, to determine which of them is the dominant one. In fact, as Martin & Franklin pointed out, self esteem and perception of others' attitudes are related to other factors that are found in minority group members' behavior and reactions, such as: repression, denial, competition, cooperation, guilt feelings and cynicism.

The author acknowledges the fact that internal and external validity could not be completely controlled in the present study. Validity and reliability of the scales used were not available. The author's approach to the subjects, and his explanation of their task, might have biased their answers. Due to the deliberate, non random, sampling procedure used in the present study, it is the author's opinion that subjects might be seen as representing only the Jewish population of Toronto. That sampling procedure might have caused biased data - a fact which could be seen as an explanation for the non significant results obtained for hypotheses 3 and 4.

The present investigator checked three main effects: age, sex and religious affiliation, as well as the beforementioned four hypotheses. It was found that there was an age main effect. The youngest people (19-27 years old), had the lowest mean score, and the oldest group of people (46 - 75 years old) had the highest mean score on Israeli Attitude Scale.

Harris & Watson (1946), Prothro (1952), and Campbell (1947) indicated that attitudes differed at different ages. Attitude change was positively correlated to age and its by-product - life experience. Sanua (1970) pointed out that studies that have been done in the U.S. found that attachment to Israel was correlated to age.

Such attachment to Israel was expressed by 41% of those who were 39 and younger, and by 67% of those who were older than 60.

The author believes that as people get older, their values change, (see also Hollander 1967, pp. 117-120). Because of more life experience, the older Jewish people are more concerned with Israel and recognize that they have missed the feeling of spiritual security in their homeland. The full impact of the country and its importance in Judaism is not fully realized by the youngest generation who have learned about Israel and may be concerned with their homeland, but are unwilling to devote time and energy for the State. It is quite possible that as these young people grow older, their values will change and they will feel and express higher positive attitudes toward Israel.

Attitudes and values are both learned in terms of restructuring of the psychological field. This process is a dynamic one, insofar as attitudes and values are subject to change through the acquisition of new information.

(Hollander 1967, p. 117)

Sex main effect is frequently mentioned in relevant literature (Sodhi 1958, Toch & Rabin 1962 and Rosenberg 1965). In the present study there was no significant difference found between males and females in their attitudes toward Israel. Males scored, on the average, 1.98 (on a scale of 120) more than females on the Israeli Attitude Scale.

Taft (1967) studied attitudes of Australian Jews toward Israel. He reported that there was no sex main effect. Plaught (1968) as well as Rosenberg (1971), pointed out that there was no difference between males and females in their attachment and atti-

tudes toward Israel.

The author believes that all Jewish people have the same problems caused by their being Jews and, therefore, will express the same need for compensation. Positive attitude and attachment to Israel, will be beneficial to them. In the present study, most of the subjects attempted to represent their mates, who were not present when they answered the questionnaires. Several of those people have told the investigator that they assumed their mates would agree with most of their answers. It is possible that married couples, who are both working and are exposed to the same environment, would probably reflect similar feelings and attitudes toward Israel.

As was expected, there was a religious affiliation main effect. People with different degrees of religious affiliation expressed different intensities of positive attitudes toward Israel. The orthodox Jews had the highest mean score of attitudes toward Israel, while the reform had the lowest mean score. Sanua (1970) reported that U.S. Jews, from various religious subgroups, have shown different attitudes toward Israel. The orthodox Jews had the strongest attachment to Israel.

Orthodox Jews show higher levels of attachment to Israel but not as high as expected. Reform Jews express the least desire to support Israel.

(p. 4)

That difference could be explained by the religious meaning Israel has for the Jewish people (Plaugt, 1968). Israel is mentioned many times in prayers and is seen as the holy land. It is referred

to as the birth-place and centre of Judaism. As the orthodox Jew, more than the conservative Jew, directs his life according to his religious beliefs, the State of Israel has more religious meaning for him than it has for the conservative or reform Jews. Shmueli (1958) emphasized the important place the land of Israel has in the Jewish tradition. According to Shmueli, the land will have its most important place in the days of the Messiah.

The Messianic king would gather all the scattered folk of Israel to their land, and the redemption of Israel, was also to be the redemption of the entire world. (p. 158)

The fact, which was so thoroughly emphasized, was that positive attitudes and attachment to Israel were a result of feelings which could be defined as unfavorable toward self and the present situation. In other words, positive attitudes toward Israel, were thought to be a result of a negative situation that the individual is in at the present. This point has not yet been investigated, regarding Jewish people in the Diaspora. It suggests the assumption that their need for a state of their own, and their favorable attitudes toward Israel are a result of negativism and is aimed to fulfill a loss of other attributes and desires. The reader may believe that the present investigator considers that only negativism could be the cause for positive attitudes toward Israel. The fact is not so. Israel, as the country of the Jews, the ancient

holy land, and a fairly developed country, has taken its place in the hearts of many Jews, in fact most of them. It is beyond any doubt that particularly after the last two wars (1967, 1973) that there are very few Jews that might not have any positive attitudes toward that country. However, positive attitudes might differ and range from low to very high, and this point was under investigation in the present study. The question was not IF there are positive attitudes toward Israel, but WHAT is the intensity and the causes that evoke them.

Mr. Oscar Cohen (1974) of the Anti Defamation League of B'nai Brith, in a personal letter to the present investigator, said:

Support for Israel is almost so total at the present time... I would suggest (this is impressionistic but I think accurate) that Jewish concern for Israel has greatly heightened to near unanimity since the 1967 war.

The present study confirms that prediction. Overall, there is a positive attitude toward Israel which differs between individuals according to many factors, with self esteem and perception of Gentiles' attitudes being dominant. Canadian Jews, from where a sample for the present study has been drawn, have a developed community life, whereby synagogues and recreation centres encourage relationships with Israel. Canadian Jews, unlike the American Jews, believe and behave as if Israel were their home country, and a place where they may visit or settle. Livitnoff (1969) pointed out that:

American Jews automatically think of themselves as Americans, but in Canada, they are primarily Jews. (p. 173)

According to Livitnoff, Zionism makes much more headway in Canada than in the U.S. In Canada, there exists a comprehensive Jewish representative organization making for tribal unity and discipline.

Heller (1965) saw the Canadian Jewry as one of the most flourishing communities in the Diaspora. He indicated that Canadian Jewry not only see themselves as Jews primarily, but behave and emphasize their relations to Israel by raising funds and organizing tours to the country. Rosenberg pointed out that:

There can be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of Canada's Jews are fully in favour of Israel. (p. 484)

Implications

As the land of Israel is taking an important part in other religions (Christianity, Muslem, Bahaiian), as well as in the Jewish religion, it would be of great interest to investigate the attachment of Gentiles to Israel according to their religious affiliation.

Future research can compare the causes for the attachment and attitudes found in other minority groups toward their country of origin.

Future research could also investigate attitudes toward Israel as expressed by Canadian born Jews, non-Canadian Jews, and Israelis. It is quite possible to find differences in attitudes of people who were born and raised in different places at different times. Visiting Israel may influence Jewish attitudes toward the State, and future research might consider that influence. Conclusions of such a study could serve as feedback to improve pro-Israeli publications.

The Israeli government, in its very intensive endeavors to approach the Jewish people in the Diaspora to get their support, (politically as well as economically) and to influence them to immigrate to Israel, could benefit from the present study. Israeli representatives could emphasize the negative implications (such as low self esteem, a sense of belonging and psychological security),

of living in the Diaspora, and may raise the issue of living in a Jewish country, as well as the need for psychological security.

As there are very few studies in this area, it is suggested that future research should deal with Jewish attitudes toward Israel with relation to educational background and the attitude of parents. It should include measures of the individuals' interaction with the majority as well as more indices about his communal involvement - these are variables that were not investigated in the present study.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. Study of Organ Inferiority and It's Physical Compensation.
New York: Nervous and Mental Diseases Publishing Co., 1917.
- Adorno, T.W. Frankel-Brunswick, E. Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N.
The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Allport, G.W. The Nature of Prejudice. New York: Doubleday & Co.
Inc., 1954.
- Auld, F. Influence of social class on personality test responses.
Psychological Bulletin, 1952, 49, 318-332.
- Campbell, A. Factors associated with attitudes toward Jews. In:
Newcomb, M.T. & Hartley, E.L. (Eds.)
Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, 1947.
- Clark, B.K. Prejudice and Your Child. Boston: The Beacon Press,
1955.
- Cothran, T.C. Negro conceptions of white people.
American Journal of Sociology, 1951, 56, 458-467.
- Deutch, M. & Solomon, L. Reactions to evaluations by others as
influenced by self evaluations. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 93-111.
- Dinur, B.Z. Israel and the Diaspora. Philadelphia: The Jewish
Publication Society of America, 1969.
- Elliot, J.L. Immigrant Groups, Ontario, Prentice-Hall of Canada,
1971.
- Gerson, W.M. Jews at Christmas time, in: Rose A.M. & Rose C.B.
Minority Problems. New York: Harper & Row, 1965, 302-310.

- Harris, A. & Watson, G. Are Jewish or Gentile children more clannish?
Journal of Social Psychology, 1946, 24, 71-76.
- Heller, A.B. The Jew and His World. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Herman, S.N. The Reaction of Jews to Anti-Semitism. Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University Press, 1945.
- Hertzberg, A. Judaism. New York: George Braziller Inc., 1961.
- Hollander, E.P. Principles and Methods of Social Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Jones, J.M. Prejudice and Racism. Philippines: Addison-Wesley Co. Inc., 1972.
- Kage, J. With Faith and Thanksgiving. Montreal: The Eagle Publishing Co. Ltd., 1962.
- Kamerling, A.M. The Religious roots of the State of Israel. In: Rose, A. (Ed.) A People and Its Faith. Canada, University of Toronto Press, 1959.
- Kardiner, A. & Oversey, L. The Mark of Oppression: A Psychological Study of the American Negro. New York: Norton, 1951.
- Katz, D. The functional approach to the study of attitudes.
Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 163-204.
- Kertzer, M.N. What Is A Jew? New York: The World Publishing Co., 1960.
- Lewin, K. Psycho-Sociological problems of a minority group.
Character and Personality. 1953, 3, 175-187.

- Liebow, E. Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Street Corner Men.
Boston: Little Brown, 1967.
- Litvinoff, B. A Peculiar People. New York: Weybright and Talley,
1969.
- Martin, J.G. & Franklin, C.W. Minority Group Relations. Ohio,
Mevill Publishing Co., 1973.
- McLean, H.V. Psychodynamic factors in race relations.
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,
1946, 244, 159-166.
- Morsbach, G. Auto and Heterostereotypes of Indian students in South
Africa. Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1972, 1(4), 161-167.
- Myers, H.J. & Yochelson, L. Color denial in the Negro. Psychiatry,
1948, 11, 39-46.
- Plaugt, W.G. Your Neighbour Is A Jew. Philadelphia: United Church
Press, 1968.
- Prothro, E.T. & Miles, O.K. A Comparison of ethnic attitudes of
college students and middle class adults from the same state.
Journal of Social Psychology, 1952, 36, 53-57.
- Radke-Yarrow, M. Personality development and minority group member-
ship. In: Sklare, M. (Ed.) The Jews. Ill: Glencoe, 1958.
- Rogers, C.R. Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Impli-
cations and Theory. Boston: Houghton, 1951.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. New Jersey:
Princeton University Press, 1965.

- Rosenberg, S.E. The Jewish Community in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1971.
- Rosenberg, S.E. Canada's Jews: An overview. Judaism, 1971, 20, 476-489.
- Sanua, V.D. Minority status among Jews and their psychological adjustment. The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 1962, 4, 242-253.
- Sarnoff, I. Identification with the agressor: Some personality correlates of anti-Semitism among Jews. Journal of Personality. 1951, 20, 199-218.
- Secord, P.F. & Backman, C.W. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Selznick, G.J. & Steinberg, S. The Tenacity of Prejudice and Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Shmueli, E. An Israeli looks at American Jewry. Judaism, 1958, 7, 151-160.
- Sklare, M. America's Jews. New York: Random House Inc., 1971.
- Sodhi, K.S. Federal Republic of Germany. International Social Science Bulletin, 1958, Vol. 10, No. 3.
- Taft, R. The Impact of the Middle East crisis of June 1967 on Jews in Melbourne: an empricial study. Jewish Social Service Council of Victoria, December, 1967.
- Tait, J.W. Race, prejudice, and personality. School. 1946, 34, 759-798.

Time Canada Magazine, Cover Story: American Jews and Israel. 1975,
March 10, 16-24.

Toch, H.H. & Rabin, A.I. Factors entering into ethnic identification:
An experimental study. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 297-312.

Wrightsman, L.S. Social Psychology in the Seventies. California:
Wadsworth Publishing, 1972.

Zak, I. Jewish Background, Self Esteem, Jewish-American Identity and
Attitudes Toward Israel. Unpublished PhD dissertation, New
York State University, 1972.

Zweig, F. Israel and the Diaspora. Judaism, 1958, 7, 147-150.

APPENDIX A

Letter to the Participant

Dear Participant:

This set of questionnaires consists of items dealing with your ideas and opinions on certain topics.

Please read carefully the instructions in each questionnaire and respond to them as well as you possibly can. Please make sure you respond to every item.

There are no right or wrong answers. For each item state your opinion frankly.

Though you are asked to provide some personal data, we wish to assure you of your anonymity by asking you not to sign your name. The information gathered will be used for scientific purposes only and will be coded to prevent any identification of the respondent.

Thank you for your cooperation.

AMIRAM ROKACH

APPENDIX B

Israeli Attitude Scale

The following statements reflect attitudes and opinions toward Israel. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to each statement by checking (X) the appropriate category.

1. The Israelis are not fighting for the security of Israel only, but also for the life of the entire Jewish world.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
2. Most Jews should settle in Israel, or at least spend a long period of time there.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
3. A fatal blow to the State of Israel could mean the downfall of Judaism in the world.
☐ Disagree very strongly. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree.
☐ Agree. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree very strongly.
4. The life of Jews in most countries is more secure thanks to the existence of the State of Israel.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
5. Being a good Jew means one should immigrate to Israel and make it his permanent home.
☐ Disagree very strongly. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree.
☐ Agree. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree very strongly.

6. It is the duty of the Jews in Canada to assist Israel even at considerable personal sacrifice.
- ☐ Disagree very strongly. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree.
- ☐ Agree. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree very strongly.
7. A Jew should visit Israel at least once in his lifetime.
- ☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
- ☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
8. Jews in the Diaspora should learn Hebrew as a living language for better communication with Israel.
- ☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
- ☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
9. In a way, Israel is the second home for the Jews living outside it.
- ☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
- ☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
10. Israel is the only place where any Jew can live as a Jew in the broadest and fullest sense of the term.
- ☐ Disagree very strongly. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree.
- ☐ Agree. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree very strongly.
11. In order to be a good Jew in Canada, one has to donate money for Israel.
- ☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
- ☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.

12. In case of a war between Israel and the Arabs, a Canadian Jew should go to Israel to offer any assistance he is capable of, even if such act is against the expressed policies of the Canadian government.
- ()Disagree very strongly. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree.
()Agree. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree very strongly.
13. Jews should know Hebrew not just because it is the language of the Bible and the Prayer Book, but primarily because it is the national language of Israel.
- ()Disagree very strongly. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree.
()Agree. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree very strongly.
14. The Jews of Israel are my kith and kin.
- ()Disagree very strongly. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree.
()Agree. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree very strongly.
15. The existence of the State of Israel enhances one's pride in being a Jew.
- ()Disagree very strongly. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree.
()Agree. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree very strongly.
16. It is the duty of the Jews in Canada to assist the State of Israel as long as such assistance is needed.
- ()Agree very strongly. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree.
()Disagree. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree very strongly.

17. If I were to immigrate from Canada for whatever reason, I would prefer to move to Israel rather than any other country.
- ☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
- ☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
18. Israel is the centre of the Jewish culture.
- ☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
- ☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
19. One of the important roles of Jews in Canada is to persuade the Canadian people to extend political and moral support to Israel.
- ☐ Disagree very strongly. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree.
- ☐ Agree. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree very strongly.
20. It is important for Canadian Jews to celebrate the Israeli Independence Day.
- ☐ Disagree very strongly. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree.
- ☐ Agree. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree very strongly.

APPENDIX C

Jewish Perception of Gentiles' Attitude Scale

The following pairs of adjectives deal with Gentiles' attitudes toward Jews. Please answer this questionnaire as if you were a Gentile who was asked to give his opinion about Jews. Your answers should reflect not what you think about Jews, but what you think a Gentile thinks about them.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please rate the concept "JEWS" on each of the scales below. If, for example, you feel a Gentile thinks Jews are very strong, mark:

STRONG: X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : WEAK

If, on the other hand, you feel a Gentile thinks that Jews are only slightly strong, mark:

STRONG: ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : WEAK

IMPORTANT:

1. Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries.
2. Be sure you rate the concept "JEWS" on every scale.
3. Don't put more than one check-mark on a single scale.
4. Make each scale a separate and independent judgement.

Please remember that your answer should reflect what you feel
a Gentile thinks about Jews. Not what you think about them.

JEWS

| | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| ACTIVE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | PASSIVE |
| HUMOROUS: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | HUMOURLESS |
| UNSUCCESSFUL: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | SUCCESSFUL |
| THOUGHTLESS: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | THOUGHTFUL |
| EFFICIENT: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | INEFFICIENT |
| REPETITIVE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | VARIED |
| INSINCERE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | SINCERE |
| SIMPLE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | COMPLICATED |
| WISE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | FOOLISH |
| COLD: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | WARM |
| UNHAPPY: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | HAPPY |
| EXCITABLE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | CALM |
| RESERVED: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | OPEN |
| CONSERVATIVE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | PROGRESSIVE |
| STRANGE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | FAMILIAR |
| FAST: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | SLOW |
| CAREFUL: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | CARELESS |
| RELAXED: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | TENSE |
| TENDER: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | TOUGH |
| UGLY: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | BEAUTIFUL |
| VAGUE: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | PRECISE |
| STATIC: | ___:___:___:___:___:___:___: | DYNAMIC |

APPENDIX D

Self Esteem Scale

The following statements deal with one's opinion about himself, and his experiences. Although it is sometimes difficult to make such an evaluation, try to respond to these items as frankly as possible. Your responses should reflect how you perceive your experiences, and not how you think others perceive it, or think about your experiences. Please respond to each of the items by checking (X) the appropriate category.

1. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
2. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
3. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.
5. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
☐ Agree very strongly. ☐ Agree strongly. ☐ Agree.
☐ Disagree. ☐ Disagree strongly. ☐ Disagree very strongly.

6. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
()Agree very strongly. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree.
()Disagree. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree very strongly.
7. At times I think I am no good at all.
()Agree very strongly. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree.
()Disagree. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree very strongly.
8. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
()Agree very strongly. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree.
()Disagree. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree very strongly.
9. All in all, I'm inclined to feel that I am a failure.
()Agree very strongly. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree.
()Disagree. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree very strongly.
10. I certainly feel useless at times.
()Agree very strongly. ()Agree strongly. ()Agree.
()Disagree. ()Disagree strongly. ()Disagree very strongly.

APPENDIX E

Personal Data Questionnaire

Please check (X) the appropriate category in each of the following questions:

1. Are you:

_____ Male

_____ Female

2. What is your age group?

_____ 18 to 27 years.

_____ 28 to 35 years.

_____ 36 to 45 years.

_____ 46 to 60 years.

_____ 61 and over.

3. What is your religious affiliation?

_____ Orthodox.

_____ Conservative.

_____ Reform.

APPENDIX F

Raw Data Tables

| Sub. No. | <u>SCORES</u> | | | M | F | <u>AGE</u> | | | <u>REL. AFFIL.</u> | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----|-----|---|---|------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 1 | +26 | 96 | +12 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 2 | +39 | 103 | +10 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 3 | +39 | 90 | +9 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 4 | +16 | 112 | +4 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 5 | +5 | 91 | +7 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 6 | +16 | 73 | +10 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 7 | +3 | 105 | +7 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 8 | -1 | 101 | +18 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 9 | -24 | 106 | +20 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 10 | -51 | 95 | +21 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 11 | +46 | 69 | -13 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 12 | +48 | 57 | -19 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 13 | +35 | 75 | -20 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 14 | -22 | 88 | +10 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 15 | -37 | 99 | +11 | | V | V | | | | | V |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | 18-27 | AGE | | 46-75 | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|------|-------|-------------|------|---|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | | 28-45 | ORT. | | CONS. | REF. | |
| 16 | +20 | 92 | +3 | | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 17 | +33 | 105 | +15 | V | | | V | | | | V | |
| 18 | +40 | 105 | +20 | | V | | | | V | | V | |
| 19 | +15 | 103 | +25 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 20 | +31 | 125 | +30 | | V | V | | | | | V | |
| 21 | +24 | 121 | +5 | | V | V | | | | | V | |
| 22 | +26 | 97 | +14 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 23 | -1 | 110 | +12 | V | | | | | V | | | V |
| 24 | +13 | 103 | +11 | | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 25 | +13 | 107 | +24 | V | | | V | | | V | | |
| 26 | -5 | 101 | +10 | V | | | | | V | | | V |
| 27 | +41 | 112 | -8 | | V | V | | | | V | | |
| 28 | -3 | 110 | +12 | V | | | V | | | | V | |
| 29 | +15 | 93 | +10 | V | | V | | | | | V | |

| Sub. No. | <u>SCORES</u> | | | M | F | 18-27 | <u>AGE</u> | | 46-75 | <u>REL. AFFIL.</u> | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|------------|--|-------|--------------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | | 28-45 | | | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 30 | +30 | 106 | +10 | | V | | | | V | | V | |
| 31 | -6 | 112 | +14 | V | | V | | | | | V | |
| 32 | +9 | 118 | +10 | V | | V | | | | | V | |
| 33 | +4 | 136 | +25 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 34 | +19 | 108 | +15 | V | | | V | | | | V | |
| 35 | +24 | 97 | +6 | V | | | | | V | V | | |
| 36 | +23 | 94 | +4 | V | | | V | | | | V | |
| 37 | +10 | 91 | +16 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 38 | +33 | 118 | +23 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 39 | +39 | 79 | +17 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 40 | +23 | 124 | +30 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 41 | +30 | 88 | +8 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 42 | +36 | 117 | +8 | V | | | | | V | | V | |
| 43 | +55 | 110 | +2 | | V | V | | | | V | | |
| 44 | -10 | 88 | +2 | V | | | V | | | | V | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 45 | +28 | 101 | +20 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 46 | +13 | 108 | +9 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 47 | +48 | 105 | +3 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 48 | -4 | 94 | +2 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 49 | +29 | 95 | +5 | V | | | | V | | V | |
| 50 | -7 | 100 | +10 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 51 | +26 | 99 | +12 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 52 | +28 | 99 | +13 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 53 | 0 | 101 | +30 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 54 | +8 | 85 | +9 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 55 | +20 | 100 | +13 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 56 | +4 | 89 | +3 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 57 | +34 | 121 | +15 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 58 | +29 | 114 | +3 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 59 | +34 | 117 | +5 | V | | V | | | | V | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 60 | +14 | 97 | +13 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 61 | +23 | 80 | +19 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 62 | +26 | 77 | +23 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 63 | -21 | 97 | +27 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 64 | +50 | 99 | -2 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 65 | +21 | 113 | +26 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 66 | +27 | 96 | +7 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 67 | +34 | 84 | -2 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 68 | +37 | 109 | +7 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 69 | +18 | 94 | +13 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 70 | +18 | 109 | +16 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 71 | +1 | 98 | +4 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 72 | +4 | 95 | +4 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 73 | +9 | 94 | +12 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 74 | +38 | 90 | +28 | V | | V | | | | | V |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 75 | +25 | 100 | +14 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 76 | +12 | 98 | +3 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 77 | +14 | 115 | +23 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 78 | +41 | 124 | +13 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 79 | +30 | 94 | +12 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 80 | +27 | 85 | +21 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 81 | +14 | 87 | +17 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 82 | +12 | 85 | +22 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 83 | +28 | 85 | +19 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 84 | +1 | 92 | +27 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 85 | -8 | 86 | +16 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 86 | +23 | 115 | +14 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 87 | +52 | 84 | +22 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 88 | +37 | 90 | +12 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 89 | 0 | 81 | +15 | | V | V | | | | V | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 90 | +9 | 120 | +8 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 91 | +3 | 115 | +1 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 92 | +31 | 83 | +18 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 93 | +44 | 117 | +6 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 94 | +52 | 99 | +4 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 95 | +4 | 106 | +13 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 96 | +16 | 112 | +10 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 97 | +51 | 88 | +10 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 98 | +46 | 102 | +5 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 99 | +13 | 109 | +15 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 100 | +29 | 108 | +20 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 101 | +3 | 109 | +26 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 102 | +6 | 84 | +8 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 103 | +34 | 98 | +6 | | V | V | | | V | | |

| Sub. No. | <u>SCORES</u> | | | M | F | <u>AGE</u> | | | <u>REL. AFFIL.</u> | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----|-----|---|---|------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 104 | +16 | 105 | -10 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 105 | +30 | 88 | +9 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 106 | +29 | 74 | +6 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 107 | +37 | 107 | +12 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 108 | +27 | 96 | +26 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 109 | +14 | 130 | +8 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 110 | +54 | 103 | +14 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 111 | -6 | 100 | +8 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 112 | +41 | 95 | +7 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 113 | +42 | 92 | +4 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 114 | +10 | 98 | +12 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 115 | +37 | 93 | +3 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 116 | +37 | 101 | +5 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 117 | +15 | 93 | +24 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 118 | +27 | 100 | +9 | V | | | V | | V | | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 119 | +28 | 86 | +14 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 120 | +25 | 127 | +26 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 121 | +14 | 112 | +10 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 122 | +53 | 88 | +7 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 123 | +5 | 80 | +4 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 124 | -5 | 92 | +19 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 125 | +1 | 112 | +8 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 126 | +58 | 69 | +15 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 127 | -29 | 99 | +9 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 128 | +9 | 76 | +23 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 129 | +25 | 96 | +16 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 130 | +28 | 93 | +19 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 131 | -13 | 105 | +30 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 132 | +38 | 84 | +20 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 133 | -4 | 129 | +19 | V | | | V | | | | V |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 134 | +41 | 90 | +25 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 135 | +35 | 100 | +29 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 136 | +36 | 103 | +16 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 137 | +15 | 76 | +4 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 138 | +5 | 84 | +29 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 139 | +20 | 89 | +24 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 140 | +26 | 82 | +7 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 141 | +43 | 101 | +10 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 142 | +36 | 105 | +6 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 143 | +37 | 88 | +14 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 144 | +34 | 126 | +8 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 145 | +30 | 117 | +12 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 146 | +10 | 95 | +23 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 147 | -6 | 105 | +12 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 148 | +36 | 81 | +23 | | V | V | | | V | | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 149 | +2 | 93 | +29 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 150 | +8 | 118 | +12 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 151 | +8 | 80 | +20 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 152 | +13 | 103 | +19 | V | | V | | | | | V |
| 153 | +25 | 112 | +23 | | V | V | | | | V | |
| 154 | +55 | 101 | +9 | V | | | V | | | V | |
| 155 | +14 | 115 | +18 | V | | V | | | | V | |
| 156 | -6 | 94 | +15 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 157 | +21 | 111 | +21 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 158 | +18 | 122 | +14 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 159 | +33 | 108 | +14 | | V | | V | | | V | |
| 160 | +25 | 120 | +19 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 161 | +10 | 90 | +12 | V | | | V | | V | | |
| 162 | -15 | 103 | +8 | | V | | | V | | V | |
| 163 | +11 | 121 | +26 | | V | V | | | | | V |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 164 | 0 | 101 | +22 | | V | V | | | | | V |
| 165 | +6 | 113 | +8 | V | | | V | | | | V |
| 166 | +3 | 88 | +12 | | V | V | | | V | | |
| 167 | +30 | 113 | +17 | V | | | | V | | V | |
| 168 | +38 | 110 | +21 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 169 | +14 | 102 | +4 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 170 | -12 | 73 | 0 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 171 | +27 | 76 | 0 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 172 | +3 | 87 | +2 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 173 | +44 | 82 | +16 | V | | | | V | | | V |
| 174 | +3 | 88 | +13 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 175 | +22 | 106 | +28 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 176 | +22 | 120 | +16 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 177 | +40 | 99 | +22 | V | | V | | | V | | |
| 178 | -1 | 89 | +28 | V | | | | V | V | | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | AGE | | | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | 18-27 | 28-45 | 46-75 | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 179 | +1 | 90 | -3 | | V | | V | | V | | |
| 180 | +16 | 120 | +5 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 181 | 0 | 86 | +5 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 182 | +8 | 88 | +4 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 183 | -8 | 90 | +5 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 184 | -10 | 99 | +12 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 185 | +22 | 124 | +17 | | V | | V | | | | V |
| 186 | +14 | 88 | +9 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 187 | +34 | 99 | +17 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 188 | +8 | 91 | +20 | V | | | | V | V | | |
| 189 | +26 | 103 | +22 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 190 | +24 | 117 | +16 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 191 | +35 | 113 | +2 | | V | | | V | | | V |
| 192 | +15 | 105 | +9 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 193 | -12 | 89 | +12 | | V | | | V | V | | |

| Sub. No. | SCORES | | | M | F | 18-27 | AGE | 46-75 | REL. AFFIL. | | |
|-------------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|------|
| | AI | GA | SE | | | | 28-45 | | ORT. | CONS. | REF. |
| 194 | +48 | 114 | +17 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 195 | +24 | 94 | +12 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 196 | +39 | 106 | +2 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 197 | -17 | 92 | -1 | | V | | | V | V | | |
| 198 | +1 | 82 | +6 | | V | | | V | V | | |